

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-2031V

UNPUBLISHED

JENNIFER MEYER,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: December 16, 2022

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;
Table Injury; Tetanus Diphtheria
acellular Pertussis (Tdap) Vaccine;
Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA)

Ronald Craig Homer, Conway, Homer, P.C., Boston, MA, for Petitioner.

Emily H. Manoso, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On December 30, 2020, Jennifer Meyer filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a Table injury – a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) – as a result of her October 21, 2019 Tetanus-diphtheria-acellular-pertussis (“Tdap”) vaccination. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges the vaccine was administered within the United States, and that there has been no prior award or settlement of a civil action on her behalf as a result of her injury. Petition at ¶¶ 5-6. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

¹ Because this unpublished Ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On December 16, 2022, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 8-9. Specifically, Respondent indicates that

[m]edical personnel at the Division of Injury Compensation Programs, Department of Health and Human Services ("DICP"), have reviewed the petition and medical records filed in the case. It is respondent's position that petitioner has satisfied the criteria set forth in the Vaccine Injury Table ("Table") and the Qualifications and Aids to Interpretation ("QAI") for SIRVA.

Id. at 8 (citing 42 C.F.R. §§ 100.3(a)(XIV)(B), 100.3(c)(10)). Respondent further agrees that

[w]ith respect to other statutory and jurisdictional issues, the records show that petitioner timely filed her case, that she received the Tdap vaccine in the United States, and that she satisfies the statutory severity requirement by suffering the residual effects or complications of her injury for more than six months after vaccine administration.

Id. (citing § 11(c)(1)(D)(i)).

In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master